

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT
FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL VOCAL MUSIC

A Field Report
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Music Education

by
Thomas J. Netzel
December 1970

1970
N457

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT
FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL VOCAL MUSIC

by

Thomas J. Netzel

Approved by Committee:

Robert R. Shultz
Chairman

Nathan E. Jones

James Dyer
ASSOCIATE Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Importance of the study	2
Limitation of the study	3
Definitions of Terms Used	3
Measurement and evaluation	3
General music	4
Music appreciation	4
Chorus	5
Combined chorus	5
Glee Club	5
Elective and selective	5
Secondary school	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Purposes of Evaluation	6
Objectives of Vocal Music in the	
Secondary Schools	7
Curriculum Offerings in Vocal Music	
on the Secondary School Level	9
Criteria for Evaluation	10
Development of Evaluation Instrument	12

CHAPTER

PAGE

III. QUESTIONNAIRE, PROCEDURES, AND FINDINGS	17
Format of Questionnaire	17
Procedure for Sampling	18
Results of Questionnaires	20
Vocal music curriculum	20
General music or music appreciation	20
Chorus	21
Combined chorus	22
Glee Club	22
Voice class	23
Chorus and/or general music or music appreciation	23
Elective and selective	23
Rehearsals and grades	24
Grading systems used by vocal music teachers	24
Estimation of present evaluation system	25
Evaluation instrument	25
Vocal skills	26
Musical understandings	26
Personal-social adjustment	27
Appreciation	27

CHAPTER

PAGE

Proposed usage of the evaluation instrument	29
Positive comments about evaluation instrument	29
Negative comments about the evaluation instrument	30
Meaningful grades	30
Actual Use of Evaluation Instrument	31
Testing group	31
Procedure	31
Grade scale	33
Computation of grade by hand	34
Computation of grade by computer	34
Grade distribution	36
Understanding of grades by student and parent	36
Computation time and cost	37
Use of music student performance record by other vocal music teachers	37
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	39
Restatement of the Problem	39
Summary	39
Vocal music curriculum	39

CHAPTER	PAGE
Grades and grading	41
Evaluation instrument	41
Use of evaluative instrument	41
Conclusions	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIX A. Student Teaching Evaluation Record . .	47
APPENDIX B. Proposed and Finalized Evaluation Instrument	48
APPENDIX C. Letter and Questionnaire	50
APPENDIX D. Sample of Completed Mark-Sense Card . .	55
APPENDIX E. Computer Print-Out	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation has been and remains an integral part of the educational process. In 1957, Edwin Wandt and Gerald Brown said: "A use of evaluation is to serve as a basis for summarizing and reporting pupil progress."¹ Assigning marks or grades (A, B, C; 94, 87, 76; credit or non-credit; and the like) has been the accepted instrument of evaluation. Periodic grading has been and is required by most schools offering regularly scheduled music classes. For the music teacher, grading students in applied music classes is a difficult task due to the lack of objective evidence. It is not as simple as grading a set of mathematical problems or language papers. Therefore, a system of grading which uses subjective and objective criteria should be devised.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this project to: (1) determine recommendations of music authorities in the area of grading techniques; (2) survey selected

¹Edwin Wandt and Gerald W. Brown, Essentials of Educational Evaluation (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1957), p. v.

Iowa secondary vocal music educators to determine effectiveness of the proposed evaluative instrument; (3) devise an instrument for more objective vocal music evaluation, based on survey results, and (4) use the instrument in an actual vocal music situation.

Importance of the study. Methods of grading choral musicians have not involved a consistent norm within most systems and, therefore, tended to be inconsistent, varied, and almost totally subjective. Without specific grading criteria, vocal music teachers are involved in a plan of grading that does not adequately reflect the quality or amount of student progress. Under such a pattern, students and parents cannot be certain as to what the music grades are attempting to measure and, therefore, misunderstanding frequently arises. This lack of consistency in giving grades and the lack of understanding by those receiving grades indicates the need for a study that will lead to an evaluative system that will have meaning to teachers, students, and parents.

Robert W. Winslow, in regard to "Grades and Grading" said:

The values of a sound, well-planned grading system cannot be overlooked. In the first place, grades can be made useful in stimulating and encouraging greater musical achievements. Secondly, if properly and carefully conceived, periodic grading may prove to be

invaluable in providing both pupil and parent with a vivid progress report. Certainly it must be agreed that well-formulated evaluation of a pupil's work is basic to learning and growth processes.¹

This study is intended to devise an instrument for effective evaluation of vocal music students. The testing instrument may be used with or without the assistance of the computer.

Limitation of the study. The study was limited to a development of an inclusive evaluation instrument. It was not the purpose of this study to define the measurement or standards which would result in grades or ratings (superior-average; A-C; credit-non-credit and the like). All music teachers, if they use the instrument, will have to write tests, set up their own standards, and interpret and apply their findings for their local situation.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Measurement and evaluation. Measurement is the process that attempts to obtain a quantitative description of the progress or lack of progress of an individual relative to specific traits, abilities, characteristics or behaviors.

¹Robert W. Winslow, "Grades and Grading," Music Education in Action, Archie N. Jones, editor (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960), p. 351.

Measurement tries to characterize a pupil in terms of that progress in an objective a way as possible. Evaluation is a process which uses information derived from the objective and subjective measurements in order to arrive at a value judgment. The information used in evaluation can be obtained by using measuring instruments as well as other techniques which do not yield quantitative results. Since measurement is an essential part of evaluation, music grading must contain this element if it is to have validity.¹

General music. A report by the Music in American Education Committee or General Music states that "general music is a class of pupils meeting together to participate in a wide variety of music activities."² These would include singing, playing of instruments, listening, and study of music history and theory.

Music appreciation. The term music appreciation, as it is used in this study, refers to a planned formal class with emphasis on music literature, history, and listening.

¹Stanley J. Ahmann and Marvin D. Glock, Evaluation in Education (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1959), pp. 32-33.

²Music in American Education (Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1955), p. 160.

Chorus. Even though a distinction can be made between a chorus and choir, for purposes in this study, a mixed group of male and female singers in which there are several performers to each part is called a chorus.

Combined chorus. A mixed group of male and female singers composed from different grade levels such as junior and senior students and forming a senior high chorus is referred to as combined chorus.

Glee Club. A group of singers of the same sex, either male or female is a Glee Club.

Elective and selective. When a student selects a course from several, this is known as an elective course. When a teacher chooses or picks students who have elected to take a course, this is called selective.

Secondary school. Secondary school, as used here, refers to grades seven through twelve even though grades seven through nine (junior high) may be contained in one building and grades ten through twelve (senior high) contained in another.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A wealth of literature has been written on the subject of evaluation. However, only selected literature related to the topic of music evaluation is included here.

I. PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

According to Ahmann and Glock, there are two purposes for evaluation:

1. It helps the teacher evaluate the degree to which educational objectives have been attained;
2. It helps the teacher know his pupils so that educational experiences can be planned according to objectives, prior experiences, and interests of his pupils.¹

Ahmann and Glock stated the purposes of evaluation in relation to the teacher. However, since decisions are frequently based upon summary reports and grading, evaluation must also be made in relation to the student. Edwin Wandt and Gerald Brown have said that evaluation, based on stated objectives, should "reveal the state at which pupils

¹Stanley J. Ahmann and Marvin D. Glock, Evaluation in Education (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1959), p. 32.

have arrived in the learning process."¹

This implies that the student, as well as the teacher, understand and benefit by the process and results of evaluation.

Evaluation, then, should furnish a picture of pupil progress to the student, parent and teacher. Evaluation not only places a value upon past performance but it also indicates the path for future development according to the objectives of the program. Objectives are also subject to change as the needs of the students are uncovered through constant evaluation.

II. OBJECTIVES OF VOCAL MUSIC IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The process of education, whether it be music education or general education, as stated by Edwin Wandt and Gerald Brown in the preface of their book, Essentials of Educational Evaluation, involves three steps: (1) the objectives must be determined; (2) experiences designed to achieve these objectives must be provided; and (3) results must be measured and evaluated to determine if objectives

¹Edwin Wandt and Gerald W. Brown, Essentials in Educational Evaluation (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1957), p. 3.

have been achieved.¹

The objectives of vocal music education are many and varied. The most inclusive list found was written in the book, Basic Concepts in Music Education. They included the following:

1. To be able to recognize the factors essential for effective musical performance.
2. To be able to recall historical information pertinent to the music he enjoys.
3. To be able to sing in tune, accurately and expressively.
4. To be able to read music sufficiently to pursue it independently.
5. To be able to apprehend the melody of music he hears.
6. To be able to be responsive to quality in musical performance.
7. To be able to be responsive to the expressive value of different types of music.
8. To be able to respond favorably to constructive criticism of musical efforts.
9. To strive to improve his musical competence.²

As has been stated, the above-listed objectives of vocal music were found to be the most inclusive. However, another objective was stated by Leeder and Haynie in their book, Music Education in the High Schools. This objective stated that one should be able to "develop the social

¹Ibid., p. v.

²Charles Leonard, "Evaluation in Music Education," Basic Concepts in Music Education (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 317.

ability to work and share with others."¹

These were found to be the objectives of vocal music. Experiences must now be provided whereby these objectives can be achieved.

III. CURRICULUM OFFERINGS IN VOCAL MUSIC ON THE SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL

Curriculum offerings in vocal music on the secondary school level are not the same at all schools. The minimum choral offering in many secondary schools is a chorus of unselected voices whose membership is based solely on a desire to sing. In the book, Music Education for Teen-Agers, it stated that the ideal minimum of choral activity should include the above-stated group, but there should also be a selective organization for the more gifted and interested student. Boys' and girls' glee clubs may also be offered, serving as training groups pointing toward membership in the advanced selective choir. Solo and ensemble experiences add opportunities for the student. Voice class could also be offered as a regular part of the music curriculum. However,

¹Joseph A. Leeder and William S. Haynie, Music Education in the High Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 61.

the size of the school does impose limitation on its choral activities which are determined by vocal resources at hand. Even the smallest school may offer a rather extensive vocal music curriculum for all pupils. There is no reason for a small school to be unsuccessful in meeting the musical needs of its students. Quantity of students does not necessarily limit the quality of the program.¹

IV. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Objectives and ideal curriculum offerings in vocal music have been stated. Following the process of educational evaluation as previously stated by Wandt and Brown, the results must be measured and evaluated to determine if the objectives have been achieved.

Based upon the objectives, evaluative criteria must be formulated for the progress of the student to be measured and evaluated. Vocal skills and technical knowledge can be ascertained by prescribed levels of vocal achievement. Factors such as diction, breath control, and pitch, can be observed and linked with the more tangible

¹William Raymond Sur and Charles Francis Schuller, Music Education for Teenagers (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958), p. 48.

evidences of musicianship to form the basis of grading.¹ Good tone, also, must be characterized by the essential qualities of resonance, purity, and freedom from restriction.² The four: diction, breath control, pitch and tone quality, were found to be the necessary vocal skills. Of these four vocal skills, pitch or intonation was found to be the most important. In the book, An Objective Psychology of Music, Lundin stated that "one will not be a successful singer, regardless of the fine quality of his voice, if he cannot sing in tune."³

According to Leeder and Haynie, all applied music activities should involve some study of theory, history, and literature.⁴ Included in these three areas are musicianship through musical knowledge and music appreciation. Fundamentals of musical knowledge were found to include:

1. rhythm, meter, tempo
2. melody and harmony
3. form and design

¹Leeder and Haynie, op. cit., pp. 226-227.

²Ibid., p. 72.

³Robert W. Lundin, An Objective Psychology of Music (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1953), pp. 19-20.

⁴Leeder and Haynie, op. cit., p. 227.

4. phrasing
5. dynamics
6. pitch
7. a cappella singing (without accompaniment)
8. sight-reading
9. part-singing¹

Through the study of varieties and style of music, composers, and the eras in which they lived, a student can acquire a better understanding of music and possibly a greater appreciation for music.

Musical progress was found to be only one part of the criteria for evaluation. Another area which must receive analysis is the person or student himself. Leeder and Haynie said the student's work must not only be evaluated in terms of musical progress but also in terms of attitude and effort.²

This investigator found, through research, that the criteria upon which evaluation is made are in areas of vocal skills, technical knowledge, appreciation and understanding, and personal adjustment.

V. DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

One of the final steps in the process of evaluation was found to be the measuring of results to determine if

¹John R. Thomson, "A Curriculum Guide for Vocal Music," The Iowa Music Educator, John W. Mitchell, editor (Cedar Falls, Iowa: Condon Printing Company, XXII, No. 3, 1970), p. 22.

²Leeder and Haynie, loc. cit.

the objectives have been achieved and to reveal the stage at which the pupil has arrived in the learning process. For these reasons, some kind of progress report was found to be necessary.

The procedures used in evaluation were found to be varied. They included paper and pencil tests, ranking and rating scales, performance tests, anecdotal records, and sociometric procedures. The purpose of these and other evaluation methods was to provide information related to the student's progress and attainment of desired objectives.

Ahmann and Glock said that evaluation can be divided into three areas: (1) the evaluation of academic achievement, (2) the evaluation of aptitudes, and (3) the evaluation of personal-social adjustment. The evaluation of academic achievement included those techniques designed to measure the degree to which objectives have been achieved. Aptitude evaluation was designed to predict the achievement that would occur if the student was given proper training. The evaluation of personal-social adjustment was found to be somewhat of a miscellaneous category. It included attitude, interest, and personality development in relationship to the objectives.¹

¹ Ahmann and Glock, op. cit., pp. 32-34.

Ahmann and Glock also said that some evaluation is difficult to attain because student performance such as the ability to sing a song is quite complex. Involved in these vocal skills are the physical and mental coordination, language and non-language skills, and the intangible ability of an individual to express himself musically. The principal evaluation of student performance must be based on procedures displayed by student and products yielded by the procedures.

Paper-and-pencil tests could be used to measure the understanding and verbal aspects of vocal music objectives. However, the instruments used in evaluation of procedures and product are primarily of the non-paper-and-pencil testing type. Because of this, it was discovered that ranking and rating methods, check lists and anecdotal records were used or applied. Ahmann and Glock cautioned against the unreliability of such methods. They said:

Performance evaluation tends to be unreliable in many instances--a deficit which can be traced to the fact that pupil performance is not always successfully sampled and the observer is not always consistent. Repeated sampling of pupil performances and repeated independent observation by qualified instructors increase the reliability of the process.¹

In regard to personal-social adjustment, Ahmann and Glock have said that adequate personal-social adjustment in

¹ibid., pp. 245-246.

students is emphasized by society's needs. Achievement in this area of development is as much the responsibility of the schools as is the teaching of the skills. Therefore, it was found that evaluation of personal-social adjustment played an important part in the school's instructional programs.¹

According to research, then, it was discovered that devices such as rating scales, anecdotal records, and the like, could better evaluate the degree to which a pupil has attained the desired objectives.²

Georgia Sachs Adams, in her book Measurement and Evaluation in Education, Psychology, and Guidance, stated that "a rating scale requires a qualitative evaluation of aspects of a total performance or product." Therefore, it was found that the first step in constructing a rating scale was to break down the process or product into components. It was also found that decisions may also have to be made concerning the relative importance of different components.³

In the development of the proposed evaluative instrument, the rating scale was then broken down according

¹Ibid., p. 477.

²Ibid., p. 68.

³Georgia Sachs Adams, Measurement and Evaluation in Education, Psychology, and Guidance (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), p. 408.

to its components based on the objectives and the most common criteria used in evaluation stemming from the objectives.

In his book, A Guide to Effective Music Supervision, R. H. Weyland included a Performance File applicable for the evaluation of an instrumental student. He stated that a similar chart could be devised for vocal music students.¹

This performance file plus the Student Teaching Evaluation Record (Form RA-KU, 1968) used by the University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, constituted the basis for the proposed evaluation instrument. (See Appendix A)

The responsibility to measure student attainment is inescapable. The teacher must collect as much objective data of pupil progress and comparative achievement as possible.

Only by deciding what kind of evidence to collect, and by setting up a system for collecting and recording this evidence, can the teacher be in a position to adequately and fairly report² on the pupil's achievements and typical behaviors.

¹R. H. Weyland, A Guide to Effective Music Supervision (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1960), pp. 184-187.

²Wandt and Brown, op. cit., p. 67.

CHAPTER III

QUESTIONNAIRE, PROCEDURES, AND FINDINGS

The questionnaire in this study was sent to selected Iowa teachers of secondary vocal music and was designed to obtain information in regard to curriculum offerings, methods of grading, and use of the proposed evaluative instrument. The purpose of the questionnaire was to discover inclusive criteria used in evaluation of student achievement through which meaningful grades could be determined.

I. FORMAT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire consisted of twenty questions. Eight of those questions asked for information regarding courses offered in the vocal music curriculum, time of rehearsals, and selection of students involved in vocal music activities. The next eight questions dealt with grading systems used, estimation of selected teachers' present evaluation systems, and estimation and comment concerning proposed evaluation instrument. The last four questions were concerned with enrollments of schools, percentages of students involved in vocal music activities, and the possible use of the computer in regard

to the evaluation of vocal music students. The teachers were also asked to make comments and comparisons.

II. PROCEDURE FOR SAMPLING

A letter, the questionnaire, and the proposed evaluation instrument were mailed to seventy-two Iowa teachers of secondary vocal music representing fifty Iowa school districts. (See Appendixes B and C) These districts were selected from the Iowa Educational Directory (1968-1969). There were a total of 484 school districts. Twenty-three districts had a population of twenty thousand or more people. Four hundred and sixty-one districts had a population of less than twenty thousand people. Questionnaires were sent to selected vocal music instructors in the twenty-three districts with a population of twenty thousand or more people. Questionnaires were sent to selected secondary vocal music instructors in twenty-seven school districts with a population of less than twenty-thousand people. Based upon the Iowa Educational Directory (1968-1969), these twenty-seven districts were selected alphabetically taking every seventeenth district with a population of less than twenty-thousand people.

Forty-three questionnaires were sent to the twenty-three school districts which had, according to the Iowa

Educational Directory (1968-1969), a population of twenty-thousand or more people. Of the forty-three questionnaires mailed, twenty-three were sent to high school vocal music instructors, and twenty were sent to junior high vocal music instructors.

Twenty-nine questionnaires were sent to twenty-seven school districts which had, according to the Iowa Educational Directory (1968-1969), a population of less than twenty-thousand people. Of the twenty-nine questionnaires mailed, fifteen questionnaires were sent to high school vocal music instructors, three questionnaires to junior high vocal music instructors, and eleven questionnaires were sent to vocal music instructors who taught both junior and senior high vocal music.

Twenty-two questionnaires were returned by instructors who taught in eighteen school districts of twenty-thousand or more people. Nineteen questionnaires were returned by instructors who taught in eighteen school districts of less than twenty-thousand people.

Of the seventy-two questionnaires mailed to secondary vocal music teachers in fifty Iowa school districts, forty-one responses were received from thirty-six Iowa school districts. This resulted in a return of 57 per cent of the questionnaires from 72 per cent of the districts.

III. RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

Vocal music curriculum. The questionnaire asked teachers for information regarding courses offered in the vocal music curriculum of the secondary schools in which they taught. These courses included general music and/or music appreciation, chorus, glee club, and voice class.

General music or music appreciation. Of the forty-one teachers responding to the questionnaire, thirty-one teachers indicated that they taught in secondary schools which offered courses in general music or music appreciation. Ten teachers taught in schools that did not offer general music or music appreciation. The grade levels and the number of schools which offered these courses were as follows:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Number of Schools Offering General Music and Music Appreciation</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Reporting</u>
7	26	61
8	23	56
9	6	15
10	9	22
11	10	24
12	6	15
Other (6th Grade)	1	2

The "other" response in the above list came from a teacher who taught in a Middle School which included sixth grade.

This information indicated that approximately 61 per cent of the schools which reported did offer general music or music appreciation at the junior high level, and approximately 24 per cent of the schools which reported did offer general music or music appreciation at the high school level.

Chorus. Of the forty-one teachers who responded to this question, forty taught in schools which offered chorus and one teacher taught in a school which did not offer chorus. The grade levels involved in these choruses were as follows:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Number of Schools Offering Chorus</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Reporting</u>
7	32	78
8	35	85
9	31	76
10	30	73
11	30	73
12	30	73
1 Other (6th grade)	1	2

This information indicated that approximately 85 per cent of the schools which reported did offer chorus at the junior high level and approximately 73 per cent of the schools which reported did offer chorus at the high school level. Two per cent of the "other" response involved a sixth grade contained in a Middle School.

Combined chorus. Thirty-six of the forty-one teachers who responded to the questionnaire taught in schools where different grade levels were involved in each chorus. Five teachers taught in schools where there was no combined chorus. The combinations and frequencies were as follows:

<u>Grade Levels Involved in Combined Chorus</u>	<u>Number of Schools Involved</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Reporting</u>
7-8	11	27
8-9	5	12
7-8-9	11	27
9-10	2	5
10-11	4	10
11-12	10	24
10-11-12	21	51

This information indicated that approximately 27 per cent of junior high schools which offered choral activities had a combined chorus. Approximately 51 per cent of high schools offering choral activities had a combined chorus.

Glee Club. Of the thirty-three teachers who taught in schools which offered glee club in the curriculum, eleven of those schools had a glee club for girls. Twenty-one of those schools had both a boys' and a girls' glee club. The information obtained from the questionnaire indicated that no school had just an offering in boys' glee club. Eight teachers related that they taught in schools which did not offer glee club activities. One teacher related that he

taught in a school which offered glee club only. There were no chorus activities offered in this school.

Voice class. Of the forty-one teachers who responded to this question on the questionnaire, twenty-one indicated that voice class was offered in the school in which they taught and twenty indicated that voice class was not offered in the school in which they taught.

Chorus and/or general music or music appreciation. Twenty-nine, or approximately 70 per cent of the teachers, indicated that either or both of these choral activities were in addition to the general music or music appreciation courses which were offered in their schools. Twelve or approximately 30 per cent of the teachers indicated that both chorus and glee club were part of general music or music appreciation.

Elective and selective. All forty-one teachers indicated they had either a chorus and/or glee club in their respective schools. Of these, thirty-one or 76 per cent indicated that the choral groups were chosen by elective and selective means. Only four, or 10 per cent, of those responding had selective groups entirely. Six, or 14 per cent, had only elective choral groups.

Rehearsals and grades. Twenty-seven of the forty-one teachers who answered the questionnaire related that their choral groups rehearse during the school day. Only two teachers indicated that their choral groups rehearsed before or after school. Twelve teachers related that their groups rehearsed both during, before, and after school. Of the forty-one teachers, thirty-five teachers related that grades were given to the students who participated in choral activities whether they met during or outside of the school day. Only six teachers were involved in choral activities where no grades were given to the students.

Grading systems used by vocal music teachers. Thirty-five of the vocal music teachers surveyed indicated they gave grades in choral activities. Of these, twenty-six teachers used letters (A, B, C); two of the teachers who used letter grades gave them only at the end of the year. Four teachers used satisfactory or unsatisfactory, three teachers used credit or non-credit, and two teachers used written quarterly evaluation reports. Eighty-five per cent of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire used some form of grading system. Of these, 77 per cent used letters. Thirteen per cent used one of the other grading systems mentioned above.

Fifteen per cent of all those who responded to the questionnaire used no grading system at all. This information indicated that the majority of vocal music instructors are involved in some form of grading.

Estimation of present evaluation system. When asked to indicate how they estimated their present system of evaluation, twelve of the thirty-seven teachers who had answered the question felt their present system of evaluation was inadequate. Two of the thirty-seven felt their systems were very inadequate. Sixteen said their systems were adequate and seven indicated their systems of evaluation were very good.

Evaluation instrument. The principal basis for the questionnaire was to survey Iowa secondary school teachers in regard to the proposed evaluation instrument and, after results had been tabulated, to devise a final evaluative instrument.

The proposed list of evaluative items consisted of fifteen items divided into four categories. If a teacher felt that each item was to be weighted in importance, he was to use the numbers four, three, two, and one; four being the most important. Of the forty-one teachers who

responded to the questionnaire, only twenty felt that the evaluative items should be weighted. None of the twenty teachers added or deleted items from the proposed list. Therefore, the final evaluation instrument remained the same as the instrument proposed. (See Appendix B)

Vocal skills. In the area of vocal skills, the responses were as follows:

<u>Vocal Skills</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
1. Intonation	3.32
2. Quality	2.73
3. Diction	2.57
4. Breath Support	3.13

The above information indicated that intonation and breath support were the most important of the vocal skills. Quality and diction were of lesser importance.

Musical understandings. In the area of musical understandings, it was again discovered that several items were more important than others; the most important being the ability to hold one's part, sing in rhythm, sight-read and hear, and the least important being able to analyze musical structure and interpret according to style and text. The results of this computation were as follows:

<u>Musical Understandings</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
5. Ability to sing in rhythm	3.00
6. Ability to hold a part	3.25
7. Ability to interpret according to style and text	2.33
8. Ability to analyze musical structure	2.17
9. Ability to sight-read and hear through an understanding of musical symbols	3.00

Personal-social adjustment. All of the items under personal-social adjustment seemed to be weighted about the same in importance by the twenty teachers. Three of the items--initiative, attendance, and responsibility--received equal rating. Attitude received a higher rating than the others. The results were as follows:

<u>Personal-Social Adjustment</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
10. Initiative	3.00
11. Attitude	3.32
12. Attendance	3.00
13. Responsibility	3.00

Appreciation. In the area of appreciation, enjoyment was found to be rated higher than the understanding of the composer and the musical era. The results of this computation were as follows:

<u>Appreciation.</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
14. Enjoyment	3.00
15. Understanding of Composer	2.33

The order of importance, the mean rating, and the graduated mathematical weight scale of the fifteen items were as follows:

<u>Evaluation Items in Order of Importance</u>	<u>Mean Rating in Order of Importance</u>	<u>Weight Scale in Order of Importance</u>
1. Intonation (1) Attitude (11)	3.32	1.53
2. Ability to Hold a Part (6)	3.25	1.50
3. Breath Support (4)	3.13	1.44
4. Ability to Sing in Rhythm (5)	3.00	1.38
Ability to sight-read and Hear Inter- vals (9)	3.00	1.38
Initiative (10)	3.00	1.38
Attendance (12)	3.00	1.38
Responsibility (13)	3.00	1.38
Enjoyment (14)	3.00	1.38
5. Quality (2)	2.73	1.26
6. Diction (3)	2.57	1.18
7. Ability to Interpret According to Style and Text (7)	2.33	1.07
Understanding of Com- poser and Musical Era (15)	2.33	1.07
8. Ability to Analyze Musical Structure (8)	2.17	1.00

The weight scale was based upon the lowest mean rating (2.17) and received the weight of 1.00. The fourteen subsequent items were weighted mathematically based upon 1.00. Therefore, the highest weight was given to the highest mean rating (3.32) and received the weight of 1.53.

The weighted scale indicated the relative importance given to each evaluation item. This scale was based on how many times larger the mean rating of an item was than the item having the lowest rating. For example, the weight of 1.50 was equal to the mean rating of 3.25 divided by the lowest mean rating of 2.17.

Proposed usage of the evaluation instrument. Even though only twenty teachers weighted the items, thirty-one or 76 per cent of the forty-one teachers who responded to the questionnaire said they would consider using the evaluation instrument. Ten teachers, or 24 per cent, indicated they would not consider using such an instrument.

Positive comments about evaluation instrument. These quoted comments are as follows:

1. The instrument covers all items a student needs to know to be a good music student.
2. The instrument seems to include everything I want to use.
3. Student with previous musical instruction would have a better chance of doing well.
4. The instrument seems very adaptable to all grade levels.
5. The instrument tells much more than an A or B grade.
6. The instrument looks good.
7. I like the evaluation sheet.
8. The instrument appears quite complete.
9. The instrument is a fine comprehensive record of student's progress.
10. The instrument would help me grade fairly.
11. The instrument is very concise, comprehensive, and well organized.

12. The instrument would be helpful to the student.
13. The job of arriving at an authentic grade might be easier.

Negative comments about the evaluation instrument.

These quoted comments are as follows:

1. I have no opportunity to cover evaluative material.
2. The instrument is too detailed for our system.
3. There is too much emphasis on natural musical ability.
4. How do you make sure each item is evaluated accurately?
5. I don't have time.
6. The instrument is unfair to Junior High students because of changing voice.
7. What a singer does with his talent is the only criteria I use.

Meaningful grades. Although only thirty-one of the forty-one teachers indicated they might use the evaluation instrument, thirty-five teachers related that a grade given by means of the instrument would be adequate and more comprehensive than their present system of evaluation even though twenty-three teachers related that the present system of evaluation was adequate or very good.

Six teachers indicated that a grade given by means of the enclosed evaluative instrument would be inadequate and less comprehensive than their present system of evaluation.

IV. ACTUAL USE OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

It was also the purpose of this project, after an evaluation system was finalized (See Appendix B), to use the Music Student Performance Record in an actual teaching situation with and without the assistance of the computer. Comparisons were made and conclusions drawn from these comparisons.

Testing group. The Sophomore Chorus, second semester, 1970, of Newton Senior High School, Newton, Iowa, was a chorus of sixty-six students who were used in the sample run of the Music Student Performance Record.

Procedure. Early in the second semester of 1970, the instructor filled out the pertinent information on the Music Student Performance Record for each of the sixty-six students involved in the sample run. Each student was also given a pre-test which determined the point at which he was in vocal skills, musical understandings, and musical appreciation. Then, during the course of the semester, these students were tested periodically by the instructor. These vocal tests were given twice during each quarter of the second semester. Once each quarter the student was tested individually in the presence of the instructor only. This was done during the

student's study hall or before and after school. The chorus was also divided into quartets once during each quarter of the semester. This was done during the chorus rehearsal.

When the students sang individually and in a small ensemble, they were being judged according to the evaluation instrument found on the Music Student Performance Record. Each student was given a rating based upon the pre-test and the present vocal test. The ratings of 4, 3, 2, and 1 were used. If a student received a superior or 4 rating, it meant that he exceeded all requirements, achieved strong individual improvement, and performed accurately and completely.

An above average or 3 rating indicated the student performed accurately and completely most of the time, achieved some progress, and was meeting objectives of the course. An average or 2 rating indicated a student was making little progress, performed inadequately, and failed to meet requirements. A below-average or 1 rating was given to a student whose performance was completely unsatisfactory, indicated no progress whatsoever and apparently was not meeting any requirements of the course.

Each student was judged in three areas whether he was singing individually or in an ensemble. These areas included vocal skills, musical understandings, and

appreciation. In the area of vocal skills, the analysis was based on intonation, quality, diction, and breath support. Included in this was the student's understanding and appreciation of music. The student was judged on his ability to sing in rhythm, hold a part, interpret according to style and text, and sight-read. (Each student or group sang two selections: one was familiar and one was not.) The instructor was able to also determine if the student did or did not appreciate a certain selection. In regard to musical structure and understanding of the composer and his musical era, each student was asked several oral questions. Normally, this involved only familiar selections, those already studied. The personal-social adjustment of the student (initiative, attitude, attendance, and responsibility), was appraised upon the basis of the records and comments of the instructor.

Grade scale. A grading scale was devised based on the one to four ratings given by the instructor for each of the fifteen items. The rating of four was established as a grade of A; three as a grade of B; two as a grade of C, and one as a grade of D. (Students not maintaining a minimum grade of D were dropped by mid-term and, therefore, there were no grades below D.) It was determined a 3.5 to

4.0 was A, a 2.5 to 3.4 was B, a 1.7 to 2.4 was C, and a 1.00 to 1.6 was D. The highest number of points which could be attained was eighty, and the lowest number of points which could be attained was twenty. Using the above procedures, the following grade scale was developed and used:

<u>Number of Points Attained</u>	<u>Grade Points</u>	<u>Grade</u>
80-78	4.0-3.9	A/
77-74	3.8-3.7	A
73-70	3.6-3.5	A-
69-62	3.4-3.1	B/
61-56	3.0-2.8	B
55-50	2.7-2.5	B-
49-44	2.4-2.2	C/
43-38	2.1-1.9	C
37-34	1.8-1.7	C-
33-28	1.6-1.4	D/
27-20	1.3-1.0	D

Computation of grade by hand. At the end of the first quarter of the second semester, a grade for each student was attained by multiplying the points attained in each of the fifteen items by the weight assigned to each item. To achieve this total and to place a grade on the Music Student Performance Record of each of the sixty-six students took approximately five hours.

Computation of grade by computer. Toward the end of the second quarter the instructor used the computer to

assist in the evaluation of students. The testing procedure remained the same as previously explained. However, the computation of points to determine the grade changed.

Each of the sixty-six students was asked to fill out his name and course on the front side of a mark-sense card used in computer work. (See Appendix D) After this had been done, the instructor completed the back side of the computer mark-sense card. This included the total points of the first quarter of the second semester and the instructor's rating in each of the fifteen areas on the Music Student Performance Record. (See Appendix D) The students were able to complete the mark-sense card in approximately five minutes. It took the instructor approximately one hour to complete the back side of the mark-sense card for sixty-six students.

Before these mark-sense cards were sent to the Computer Center at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, a computer program was developed by the Mathematics Department of Newton High School, Newton, Iowa. The program included the formulas for finding the second quarter grade based upon the rating of the instructor and the weight of each item, and the calculation of the semester grade. The second quarter grade counted twice as heavily as the first quarter grade in the calculation of the semester grade.

The information was returned in the form of a print-out. (See Appendix E) It included the program procedures for attaining a quarter and semester grade for each student, the quarter and semester grade attained by each student, and a Job Accounting Summary--cost and computation time.

Grade distribution. The semester grade distribution in the chorus of sixty-six students was as follows:

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
A	4
A-	18
B /	22
B	13
B-	5
C /	4

It must be noted that no student received a grade lower than C~~/~~. The reason for this was that, even though these sixty-six students elected to participate in this Sophomore Chorus, the instructor selected them from one-third more than many students. Because of lack of spacial facility and the need for balance, only the better students were chosen.

Understanding of grades by student and parent. In order that the grades received be meaningful to both the student and the parent, students were asked to evaluate themselves using a similar type rating scale. This evaluation was then taken home and explained to the parents.

The actual Music Student Performance Record, which contained the evaluation instrument, was always available to each student and to the parents. Therefore, the majority of students and parents understood the evaluation and grading procedure.

Computation time and cost. According to the Job Accounting Summary, the total computation time used to arrive at the quarter and semester grades was 0.64 seconds. The cost for this computation was seventy-seven cents. The cost per pupil was 1.17 cents. With larger classes the cost would be lowered to about one cent per pupil.

Use of music student performance record by other vocal music teachers. When asked if they would consider using the evaluation instrument if the calculation could be done by computer, twenty-seven of the teachers answered in the affirmative and eleven teachers answered in the negative. One teacher was undecided. Of the forty-one teachers who responded to the questionnaire, two failed to answer this statement.

As of the present, thirteen of the forty-one teachers taught in systems which used the computer in its grading or reporting. Twenty-seven teachers did not teach in a system which used the computer. One teacher did not answer the question.

The majority of teachers indicated that approximately 25 per cent of the total enrollment of their schools was involved in vocal music activities. Twenty of the teachers who answered the questionnaire taught in schools with enrollments of approximately one hundred to four hundred students. Therefore, if the enrollment of a school was between one hundred and four hundred students, the cost of computer computation, as arrived at in the sample run of this study, would range from approximately twenty-five cents to one dollar.

Twenty-one teachers indicated they taught in schools with enrollments of approximately seven hundred to a thousand students or more. If the enrollment of a school was between seven hundred and one thousand students and approximately 25 per cent of those students were involved in vocal music courses which used the computer in calculation of grades, the cost would range from one dollar and seventy-five cents to two dollars and fifty cents, the cost of computer calculation being approximately one cent per pupil.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It was the purpose of this project to: (1) determine recommendations of music authorities in the area of grading techniques; (2) survey selected Iowa secondary vocal music educators to determine effectiveness of the proposed evaluative instrument; (3) devise an instrument for more objective vocal music evaluation, based on survey results, and (4) use the instrument in an actual vocal music situation.

II. SUMMARY

The forty-one vocal music teachers who answered the questionnaire in this project taught in thirty-six school districts in Iowa, which represented the state according to population. The rate of return of the questionnaire was 57 per cent.

Vocal music curriculum. Approximately 61 per cent of the schools which reported offered general music or music appreciation at the junior high level. At the high school level, general music or music appreciation was offered by

approximately 24 per cent of the schools which reported.

Chorus was offered at the junior high level by approximately 85 per cent of the schools which reported. Approximately 73 per cent of the schools which reported offered chorus at the high school level. Twenty-seven per cent of junior high schools which offered choral activities had a combined chorus. A combined chorus was included in approximately 51 per cent of the high schools offering choral activities.

Thirty-three of the forty-one teachers who answered the questionnaire taught in schools which had a glee club. Eight teachers indicated that they taught in a school which did not offer glee club in its vocal music curriculum. Half of the teachers indicated that voice class was included in the curriculum of the schools in which they taught.

Seventy per cent of the teachers indicated that the vocal activities were in addition to general music or music appreciation. Seventy-six per cent of the teachers indicated that the choral groups were chosen by elective and selective means, and 66 per cent of these instructors stated that rehearsal for the choral groups was held during the school day.

Grades and grading. Eighty-five per cent of the teachers gave grades in choral activities. The marking system most often used was a letter grade (A, B, C). Thirty-eight per cent of the teachers said their system of evaluation was inadequate while 62 per cent stated their system of evaluation was good.

Evaluation instrument. The fifteen items contained on the evaluation instrument were weighted by twenty or half of the teachers who reported. None of the twenty teachers added or deleted items from the proposed list. Intonation and attitude were considered to be the most important items in evaluating a student's progress. The ability to analyze musical structure was considered the least important. Mean ratings ranged from 3.32 to 2.17. Based upon the lowest mean rating, the weight scale ranged from 1.00 to 1.53.

Seventy-six per cent of the forty-one teachers, however, stated they would consider using the evaluation instrument. Seventy-six per cent of the teachers indicated that a grade given by means of the proposed evaluation instrument would be adequate and more comprehensive than their present system of evaluation.

Use of evaluative instrument. The selective Sophomore Chorus of Newton Senior High School, Newton, Iowa,

was used in the sample run of the evaluation instrument. Sixty-six students were given a pre-test and then during the course of the second semester, 1970, were evaluated on the fifteen items of the evaluation instrument. The number ratings four to one were given by the instructor. Based upon this and the weight scale, the highest number of points which could be attained was eighty; the lowest number was twenty. A grade scale was developed and used based upon the 4.0 grade point.

Calculating the grades by hand took approximately five hours. Calculating them by computer, which was located at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, took sixty-four seconds at the cost of seventy-seven cents or approximately one cent per pupil. The print-out which was returned to the instructor contained program procedures, the quarter and semester grades attained by each student, and a Job Accounting Summary. Grades attained were above average because of the ability of the students in the select group.

Even though only thirteen of the forty-one teachers taught in systems which used the computer, twenty-seven teachers indicated they would possibly use the instrument if the calculation could be done by computer. Cost per computation would range from twenty-five cents to two

collars and fifty cents. This was based upon the fact the 50 per cent of the teachers who reported either taught in schools from one hundred to four hundred students or from seven hundred to a thousand students and were teaching vocal music to approximately 25 per cent of the enrollment.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Major conclusions reached from this study based upon the selected literature, results of the questionnaire, and use of the evaluation instrument, are as follows:

1. The variety of choral activities and the criteria used in the appraisal of pupil progress were in agreement with the authorities in the field.
2. A course in general music was offered more frequently at the junior high school level than at the senior high level. This indicated a possible need for the expansion of such courses at the senior high level.
3. Grades, in order to be meaningful, should be a result of a comprehensive evaluation.
4. The instrument of evaluation developed in this study was more comprehensive and meaningful than the system of evaluation presently used by most vocal music instructors.

5. There was a reduced amount in the time and cost of calculation of grades by computer rather than by hand.
6. Although the fifteen items were ranked and weighted in importance, all items could be weighted equally in the grading procedure and calculated grades would be approximately the same.
7. The computer could be used in follow-up studies to identify deficiencies in teaching and pupil progress.

All educators are faced with evaluation. Music teachers are no exception. It was the purpose and is the belief of this investigator that the instrument of evaluation developed herein will aid the music educator in the evaluation of pupil progress and the attained grade through its use will be meaningful to the student, the parent, and the teacher. However, all music educators must continually search for better and more meaningful methods of evaluation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Georgia S. Measurement and Evaluation in Education, Psychology, and Guidance. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Ahmann, Stanley J., and Marvin D. Glock. Evaluation in Education. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1959.

Leeder, Joseph A., and William S. Haynie. Music Education in the High Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Leonhard, Charles. "Evaluation in Music Education," Basic Concepts in Music Education. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Lundin, Robert W. An Objective Psychology of Music. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1953.

Music Educators National Conference. Music in American Education. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1955.

Sur, William Raymond, and Charles Francis Schuller. Music Education for Teenagers. New York: Harper Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Thomson, John R. "A Curriculum Guide for Vocal Music," The Iowa Music Educator. John W. Mitchell, editor. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Condon Printing Company, XXII, No. 3, 1970.

Wandt, Edwin, and Gerald W. Brown. Essentials of Educational Evaluation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1957.

Weyland, R. H. A Guide to Effective Music Supervision. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1960.

Winslow, Robert W. "Grades and Grading," Music Education in Action. Archie N. Jones, editor. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960.

APPENDIX A

7.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
Cedar Falls

1968
a Ku

Student Teaching Evaluation Record

Name: _____ Date: ____/____/____ Final Grade: ____/____

School(s) _____

Subject(s) or grade(s) _____

Evaluators.. _____
Coordinator _____
Supervising Teacher(s) _____

Evaluation Scale	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	VP	Item	Score
Weight	5	4	3	2	1	Weight	
1. Accuracy of the information							
2. Clarity of the information							
3. Completeness of the information							
4. Consistency of the information							
5. Credibility of the information							
6. Relevance of the information							
7. Timeliness of the information							
8. Usefulness of the information							
9. Overall quality of the information							
10. Total score							

Professional Equipment	1..Knowledge of Subject Matter	()	()	()	()	()	X	4*	=	
	2..Understanding of Children	()	()	()	()	()	X	2*	=	
	3..Response to Suggestions	()	()	()	()	()	X	4*	=	
	4..Cooperation and Loyalty	()	()	()	()	()	X	1*	=	
	5..Daily Preparation	()	()	()	()	()	X	3*	=	
	6..Critical Judgment	()	()	()	()	()	X	3*	=	

	7.	Personal Appearance	()	()	()	()	X	1*	=	
	8.	Health and Vitality	()	()	()	()	X	2*	=	
	9.	Intelligence	()	()	()	()	X	3*	=	
	10.	Adaptability	()	()	()	()	X	3*	=	
	11.	Speech	()	()	()	()	X	2*	=	
	12.	Emotional Poise	()	()	()	()	X	4*	=	
	13.	Promptness	()	()	()	()	X	1*	=	
	14.	Initiative	()	()	()	()	X	4*	=	

School Management	15..Discipline (Directive Activity) () () () () () X 3* = ()
	16..Interest in Physical Welfare of Pupils () () () () () X 1* = ()
	17..Ability to Win and Hold the Good Will of Pupils . . () () () () () X 2* = ()
	18..Management of Details (Organisation of material, records, routines) () () () () () X 1* = ()

[illegible]

24. Attention and Response of Class	()	()	()	()	()	X	3*	=	<input type="text"/>
25. Growth of Pupils in Subject Matter	()	()	()	()	()	X	3*	=	<input type="text"/>
26. Growth of Pupils in Habits of Industry	()	()	()	()	()	X	2*	=	<input type="text"/>

Total Weighted Score . . . ()

CONVERSION TABLE

<u>Total Weighted Scores</u>	<u>Grades</u>	<u>Total Weighted Scores</u>	<u>Grades</u>
328 to 345	A/A	190 to 224	C/C
294 to 327	A/B	156 to 189	C/D
259 to 293	B/B	121 to 155	D/D
225 to 258	B/C	87 to 120	D/F
		69 to 86	F/F

APPENDIX C

1205 E. 15th Street S.
Newton, Iowa 50208
June 16, 1969

Dear Vocal Music Instructor:

Evaluation is an integral part of the educational process. Music teachers need to be concerned with evaluation. Therefore, your assistance is vitally important.

The purpose of the enclosed questionnaire is to discover what your vocal curriculum has to offer, what methods of evaluation you now use, and whether the evaluative instrument would be a more concise method of evaluation and recording.

In partial fulfillment for a Master of Music Education degree, I am writing a field report. This report deals with the development of an evaluative instrument for secondary school vocal music. Your participation in this report would be greatly appreciated.

Please complete this questionnaire by July 3, 1969, and return it in the preaddressed stamped envelope.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Thomas J. Netzel
Thomas J. Netzel
Candidate for Master of
Music Education degree
Drake University

SECONDARY VOCAL MUSIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you have a course in general music or music appreciation? Yes ____ No ____ . If so, what grades are involved? 7 ____ 8 ____ 9 ____ 10 ____ 11 ____ 12 ____ other ____
2. Do you have a chorus or choruses in your school? Yes ____ No ____ . If so, what grades are involved? 7 ____ 8 ____ 9 ____ 10 ____ 11 ____ 12 ____ other ____
3. Is there a combined chorus in your school? Yes ____ No ____
If so, what are the combinations?
____ a. 7 and 8
____ b. 8 and 9
____ c. junior high chorus
____ d. freshman-sophomore
____ e. sophomore-junior
____ f. junior-senior
____ g. senior high chorus
____ h. other ____
4. Do you have glee clubs in your school? Yes ____ No ____
If so, are they boys' ____ girls' ____ or both ____?
5. Are these choruses and/or glee clubs
____ a. part of general music or music appreciation?
____ b. in addition to general music or music appreciation?
6. Are these choruses and/or glee clubs
____ a. elective?
____ b. selective?
____ c. selective and elective?
7. When do these choruses and/or glee clubs rehearse?
____ a. during the school day
____ b. outside of the school day
____ c. during and outside the school day
8. If these choruses and/or glee clubs meet during the school day, is a grade given for this activity?
Yes ____ No ____
9. If these choruses and/or glee clubs meet outside of the school day, is a grade given for this activity?
Yes ____ No ____

10. Do you have voice classes in your school? Yes ____ No ____
11. If a grade is given for choral activity, what system of grading do you use?
- ____ a. letters (a, b, c, etc.)
 - ____ b. excellent, good, fair, etc.
 - ____ c. satisfactory or unsatisfactory
 - ____ d. credit or non-credit
 - ____ e. other _____
12. In your estimation, how adequate is your system of evaluation?
- ____ a. very good
 - ____ b. adequate
 - ____ c. somewhat inadequate
 - ____ d. very inadequate
13. Would you consider using the evaluation tool enclosed?
Yes ____ No ____ . Please comment briefly.
(Why or why not)
14. The evaluative items are listed below. If you wish to add an item, use the space provided. If you wish to subtract an item, cross it out. If you feel that each item should be weighted in importance, use the numbers 4, 3, 2, and 1; 4 being the most important.

		Weight
Vocal Skills:	1. Intonation	_____
	2. Quality	_____
	3. Diction	_____
	4. Breath support	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Musical Understand- ing Ability to:	5. Sing in rhythm	_____
	6. Hold a part	_____
	7. Interpret according to style and text	_____
	8. Analyze musical structure (chord, form, etc.)	_____
	9. Sightread and hear intervals, scales, etc., through an under- standing of musical symbols	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

Weight

Personal-social Adjustment	10.	Initiative	_____
	11.	Attitude	_____
	12.	Attendance	_____
	13.	Responsibility	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____

Appreciation	14.	Enjoyment (singing and hearing a variety of music)	_____
	15.	Understanding of the composer and musical era	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____

15. How would you consider a grade given by means of the enclosed evaluative instrument?
 _____ a. adequate
 _____ b. inadequate
16. How does the enclosed evaluative instrument compare with your present system of evaluation?
 _____ a. more comprehensive than your present system of evaluation
 _____ b. less comprehensive than your present system of evaluation
17. Would you consider using this tool if the scoring could be done by computer? Yes _____ No _____
18. Does your school system now use the computer in its grading or reporting? Yes _____ No _____
19. What is the enrollment of the secondary school in which you teach?

Junior High		Senior High	
_____	a. 100-400	_____	a. 100-400
_____	b. 400-700	_____	b. 400-700
_____	c. 700-1000	_____	c. 700-1000
_____	d. other _____	_____	d. other _____

Combined Junior & Senior High	
_____	a. 100-400
_____	b. 400-700
_____	c. 700-1000
_____	d. other _____

20. Of this number, how many students are involved in school vocal music activities?

- _____ a. 25% or less
- _____ b. 25% to 50%
- _____ c. 50% to 75%
- _____ d. over 75%

SAMPLE MARK-SENSE CARD

[illegible]

APPENDIX E

COMPUTER PRINT-OUT

```

$JOB 'GARY KNOX'
C    CHORUS GRADES      R G ISRAEL
1    DIMENSION IN(100,9),ITAB(11,2),IPOINT(15),XWT(15)      00000000
2    READ(5,6)(XWT(I),I=1,15)
3    DO 100 I=1,11
4    100 READ (5,1)(ITAB(I,J),J=1,2)      00000200
5    READ(5,1)IS,IBLANK      -0000300
6    DO 400 I=1,100
7    400 IN(I,8)=IBLANK
8    READ (5,2)LIMIT,IQUART
9    IPT=1      -0000400
10   DO 200 I=1,LIMIT      -0000500
11   READ (5,3) (IM(I,J),J=1,5),(IPOINT(K),K=1,15)      00000600
12   XTOT=IPOINT(1)*XWT(1)      -0000800
13   DO 300 M=2,15
14   300 XTOT=IPOINT(M)*XWT(M)+XTOT      00001000
15   ITOT=XTOT+.5
16   IM(I,6)=ITOT
17   ITOT=ITOT*3      00001200
18   M=7      00001300
19   9 M=1      00001400
20   10 IF(ITOT-ITAB(M,1))11,20,20      00001500
21   11 M=M+1      00001600
22   GO TO 10      00001700
23   20 IM(I,M)=ITAB(M,2)      00001800
24   IF(IQUART-1)23,23,21      00001900
25   21 IF(M-7)22,22,23      00002000
26   22 ITOT=IM(I,5)+2*IM(I,6)      00002100
27   M=8      00002200
28   GO TO 9      00002300
29   23 IF(I-1)25,24,25      00002400
30   24 IN(I,9)=-1      00002500
31   GO TO 200      00002600
32   25 IPOT=IPT      00002700
33   29 IF(IM(I,1)-IN(IPOT,1))30,26,26      00002800
34   26 IF(IM(IPOT,9))28,28,27      00002900
35   27 ITAIL=IPOT      00003000
36   IPOT=IN(IPOT,9)      00003100
37   GO TO 29      00003200
38   28 IN(I,9)=-1      00003300
39   IN(IPOT,9)=I      00003400
40   GO TO 200      00003500
41   30 IF(IPT-IPOT)32,31,32      00003600
42   31 IN(I,9)=IPT      00003700
43   IPT=I      00003800
44   GO TO 200      00003900
45   32 IN(ITAIL,9)=I      00004000
46   IM(I,9)=IPOT      00004100
47   200 CONTINUE      00004200
48   WRITE(6,4)      00004300
49   IOUT=IPT      -0004400
50   33 WRITE(6,5)(IN(IOUT,J1),J1=1,8)      00004500
51   IF(IN(IOUT,9))35,35,34      -0004600
52   34 IOUT=IN(IOUT,9)      00004700
53   GO TO 33      00004800
54   1 FORMAT(6X,13,A4)      00004900
55   2 FORMAT(6X,213)      00005000
56   3 FORMAT(6X,3A4,A4,12,2X,1511)      00005100
57   4 FORMAT(6X,'NAME',9X,'CLASS',3X,'1ST QUARTER',3X,'NEW QUARTER',      00005200
      13X,'NEW QUARTER',3X,'SEMESTER',/,30X,'POINTS',8X,'POINTS',7X,
      2'GRADE',6X,'GRADE',/)      00005300
58   5 FORMAT(3X,3A4,4X,A4,7X,13,11X,13,9X,44,7X,A4)      00005400
59   6 FORMAT(6X,15F4,2)      00005500
60   35 CALL EXIT      -0005600
61   END      00005700

```

ENTRY NAME	CLASS	1ST QUARTER POINTS	NEW QUARTER POINTS	NEW QUARTER GRADE	SEMESTER GRADE
ALLEN RON R	SC	67	66	B+	B+
ANDERSON TOM	SC	64	64	B+	B+
ANSPACH KATH	SC	69	70	A-	B+
AUFDEMRRINK	SC	56	61	B	B
BAGNALL GREG	SC	71	74	A	A-
BLUMFAYER JAM	SC	73	74	A	A-
BRIDENSTINE	SC	64	62	B+	B+
BRUCE JACK	SC	55	57	B	B
CANNON JOHN	SC	57	59	B	B
COMPTON RAND	SC	71	74	A	A-
CROW DAVID A	SC	71	75	A	A-
DAFFLITTO JA	SC	68	69	B+	B+
DANIELS BREN	SC	61	58	B	B
DAUGHERTY LY	SC	71	74	A	A-
DEATON MARA	SC	59	64	B+	B+
DERUMOE DENI	SC	66	72	A-	A-
DESKIN DEBBI	SC	67	70	A-	B+
DETTMANN JEA	SC	71	75	A	A-
DICKERSON NA	SC	66	70	A-	B+
DIDD JULIE	SC	70	67	B+	B+
DUGGAN AME R	SC	65	69	B+	B+
FISHER DAN	SC	74	74	A	A
FUNK VICKI L	SC	67	72	A-	A-
GAUSE CONNI	SC	70	74	A	A-
GIRDNER JAME	SC	69	69	B+	B+
GRANDIA KARE	SC	70	71	A-	A-
GRANDIA KATH	SC	70	74	A	A-
HAGEN PATTY	SC	55	56	B	B-
HASSIG DRAN	SC	62	67	B+	B+
HEAD MARY J	SC	67	68	B+	B+
HEIM DIANE	SC	74	75	A	A
HENARD DEE A	SC	55	57	B	B
JARMAGIN VIC	SC	66	69	B+	B+
JARMAGIN VILG	SC	72	74	A	A-
JOHNSON KEME	SC	59	63	B+	B
JONES STEVEN	SC	57	59	B	B
KLEIDENDORST	SC	65	71	A-	B+
KOHL JOHN R	SC	68	71	A-	A-
KREAGER MARC	SC	66	69	B+	B+
MIKKELSON ED	SC	49	49	C+	C+
MILES ELLEN	SC	63	62	B+	B+
MILLS JULIE	SC	73	73	A-	A-
MUTT CINDY J	SC	66	66	B+	B+
OLESON LINDA	SC	65	60	B	B
ONNEN AMY	SC	75	75	A	A
PAULSON KATH	SC	57	57	B	B
RAY BEV	SC	70	70	A-	A-
RONEY CHERYL	SC	55	56	B	B-
SCARBROUGH K	SC	74	74	A	A
SCHRADER SUE	SC	56	63	B+	B
SELBY TERRY	SC	61	58	B	B
SHOOK SUSAN	SC	61	52	B-	B-
STCLAIR KATH	SC	64	68	B+	B+
SHANK CINDY	SC	53	55	B-	B-
TAYLOR RON	SC	71	73	A-	A-
THOMPSON DEB	SC	73	72	A-	A-
THORNBURGH T	SC	59	60	B	B
TROUT CHERI	SC	62	65	B+	B+
UPDEGRAFF TA	SC	62	62	B+	B+
WASSON JEAN	SC	48	48	C+	C+
WHITE DEBBIE	SC	66	69	B+	B+
WICKETT CATH	SC	68	72	A-	A-
WIKLUND DEBB	SC	46	46	C+	C+
YOUNG DANNY	SC	57	55	B-	B-
YOUNGBERG JO	SC	56	60	B	B
VANDYKE GAY	SC	51	49	C+	C+